



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

term of reproach among men and made the rational method an unendurable stink in the nostrils of virtue. When that time comes (perhaps not in our day, but surely), he who shall be so favored as to stand upon the solid Kantian ground at the outer verge of just human inquiry, shall behold dangling betwixt heaven and earth the baseless feet of them who make haste to lay profane hands upon the very altars of the MOST HIGH GOD.

There is none like Thee among the gods, O Lord,
And no works like Thine.
All nations, which Thou hast made,
Shall come and bow down before Thee, O Lord,
And shall give glory to Thy Name.
For Thou art great, and doest wonders;
Thou art God alone.

THE PERSONAL RELATION OF CHRIST TO THE HUMAN RACE.

By GEORGE N. ABBOTT.

Within the scope of this comprehensive topic the present article will be devoted to the discussion of the following proposition, namely,

Christ's sonship to humanity is a normal and integral relation.

The truth of this proposition supposes on the side of humanity, that, considered in its normal state, it contains some latent principle or incipient germ constituting the rational ground or capacity on its part for a divine progeny. For if the relation in question be an integral one, then is not Christ's divinity in the least excluded from the human sonship; and if the sonship be a normal one, then must there be an original susceptibility for this relation in the proper nature of each party involved.

Again, if Christ's sonship to humanity be a strictly normal relation, then did he not go out of his proper species when he "became flesh"; while, on the other hand, if the relation in question were abnormal, his becoming flesh could be no otherwise regarded than as a transmigration into a lower

species of being. The former alternative, namely, that his human sonship be considered normal and in every sense rational, while at the same time it is admitted that he is divine, brings us then at once to the assumption that there is no *absolute* difference of species between the divine and the human.

Thus much explanatory may serve sufficiently to set forth the general intent of our proposition. The scientific proof of such a proposition ought, in order to suit all the relations of the subject, to be both metaphysical and physical, or ontological and physiological.

In order to pursue our argument after the most feasible method it may be necessary to expand it into the most general form, and to assume as the basis of reasoning the universal relationship necessarily subsisting between normal persons of whatever grade. This universal relationship will embrace within itself all specific normal relations, at least in the germ. The general formula of personal relationship will then constitute the principal *lemma* for the argument in hand. This formula may be given generally thus:

Every normal personality virtually contains the radical principle of every other such personality (whether actual or only normally possible).

In order to render the import of this statement as intelligible as possible, we may vary its form so as to give place to variety in the exponential terms. Using the mathematician's vocabulary, we may give the substance of our formula as follows:

All the individual pure functions of the grand personal unit or idea are implicitly mutual functions of such other.

Again, the language of the formula being, so far as practicable, conformed to that of the naturalist, the same general import may be thus expressed:

Every organically individualized rationality possesses as an essential constitutive element an INCIPIENT GERM of every other such rationality whose existence is possible in the normal organic development of the rational.

The truth of these statements is that which lies at the foundation of the ideal harmony of the moral universe.

GENERAL DEMONSTRATION.

It is of course here postulated that there is a certain ultimate or radical constituent in each proper person which forms the ground of *distinct* and permanently *self-identical* personality. Now this ultimate distinguishing principle can be no other than that principle or idea of reason which would have to be grasped in making out a *rationale* (rational solution) of that particular person's being; which principle or idea we may designate by the term *Radix Personæ*. But the ground principle of the rationale of a particular personality must be suggestive of, and in some mode or degree identical with, a universal personal idea comprehensive of a *universal personal rationale*: otherwise the particular rationale in question would be without rule or method; or, in other words, the existence of each individual person would form an entirely independent problem, and the rational conception of each person would be rendered absolutely and unconditionally *sui generis*; which is *absurd*. Consequently the universal personal idea, or the ultimate reason and seminal principle of the existence of all possible rational individuals, must be in some mode or degree identified with or involved in each *radix personæ*.

Remark.—The special application of what is here proved to the particular case in question will be made in connection with the less rigid yet more specific demonstrations which follow.

ANALOGIC* DEMONSTRATION FROM NUMERICAL UNITY.

To the general demonstration now given may be added an analogic one having especial reference to the second or mathematically stated formula above. It is therein postulated, as is plain to be seen, more distinctly than in the first given formula, that there is a grand unit or personality. In this

* This is called an *analogic* demonstration because there *may be*, as in the case of vegetable structures, actual numbers involved in the personal relations, which *may be different* from the ones suggested below. Since the writing of this essay the following passage from Fichte has been pointed out to the writer:

“Jedes Individuum ist ein rationales Quadrat einer irrationalen Wurzel, die in der gesamten Geisterwelt ist wiederum rationales Quadrat der für sie und ihr universelles Bewusstsein, welches jeder hat und haben kann—irrationalen Wurzel = dem immanenten Lichte oder Gott.”—Fichte to Schelling, Letter xxvii.

regard, that is taken for granted which it was just now one part of our object to prove.

Beginning, then, with the assumption of a *universal personal unity*, we may attempt to unfold some of the necessary implications of such a unity. Now it must be admitted that every idea which can properly be called a unity involves in some important sense the mathematical unity with its essential properties: otherwise the term *unity* in such a case loses entirely its primitive force. It appears likewise evident that the development of certain functions of the numerical unit ought to bear some specific analogy to the ideal development of any subject to which unity can be ascribed as an essential attribute. Proceeding, then, upon this presumptive analogy, let us seek to discover those simple pure functions of unity which may perhaps illustrate our subject.

In order to obtain the pure functions of any ideal subject, we proceed by the methods of *analysis* and *synthesis*, these being the two poles of all thought. But, in relation to number, *involution* and *evolution* form specific modes of synthesis and analysis.*

Now, making use of involution and evolution, we shall have three general pure functions of unity, including the undervived unit as the prime function — namely, *unity* — the n^{th} power of unity and the n^{th} root of unity, or

$$1, 1^n, 1^{\frac{1}{n}}. \dagger$$

Only the last of these three functions admits variety of value, that having in any case one value equal to that of either of the other functions and n^{-1} other values all deducible by a general solution of the equation $x^n = 1$. In order to make a single hypothetical solution, so far as possible, a complete rationale or *λόγος* of the unit, let us suppose n (the degree of the given equation) equal to infinity, and at the same time a prime number, or, more strictly, *indivisible* by any assignable number except unity.

* Possibly there may be other modes better adapted to illustrate the subject, but the course here taken is *one* way to show that unity involves the many.

† The more philosophical arrangement would be 1^n , 1 , $1^{\frac{1}{n}}$, or, fully expressed, $\left. \begin{array}{ccc} 1^n, & 1, & 1^{\frac{1}{n}}. \\ \text{Positive, Neutral, Negative.} \end{array} \right\}$

The proposed hypothetical solution will then give us out of the general pure function 1^{∞} or $1^{\infty-1}$ an infinite number of particular functions [roots], every one of which has its total significance absorbed in that of the unit, and at the same time, reciprocally, *absorbs by implication the total significance of the unit.*

Besides, one of these coördinately developed ultimate functions will be the *original unit* apparently unchanged, the remaining functions [roots] being essentially infinitesimal powers of of unity.*

The former together with the general functions 1 and 1^{∞} will then give *three equal pure functions of unity.*

In all, then, we shall have three equal functions and an indefinite number of functions coördinate or cognate with one of these three as regards development, but subordinate as regards value,—all these functions in the fullest sense implying each other.

Now, restoring our numerical unit to its place in the personal idea, we have—so far as the analogy will apply—a suggestion of *three primary coëqual persons and an indefinite number of secondary persons essentially cognate with one of the primary*; all mutually implying and as it were necessitating each other.

Still further, a *radix personæ* of the primary order involves, according to our analogy, one of the secondary order in an infinite degree; while a *radix personæ* of the secon-

* The five fifth roots of unity are

$$\begin{aligned}
 &1. \\
 &\frac{1}{5} [\sqrt[5]{5} - 1 + \sqrt{-10 - 2\sqrt[5]{5}}] \\
 &\frac{1}{5} [\sqrt[5]{5} - 1 - \sqrt{-10 - 2\sqrt[5]{5}}] \\
 &-\frac{1}{5} [\sqrt[5]{5} + 1 - \sqrt{-10 + 2\sqrt[5]{5}}] \\
 &-\frac{1}{5} [\sqrt[5]{5} + 1 - \sqrt{-10 + 2\sqrt[5]{5}}]
 \end{aligned}$$

These may serve to illustrate the form and mutual relation of cognate roots of unity of any degree whose index has the nature of a prime number.

The existence of such roots adds significance to the function 1^{∞} , which of course infolds into itself the ultimate involution of all the possible roots of unity.

The *imaginary* character of the roots (except the first) is also significant, their *real value* lying not in themselves but in the parent unit.

dary involves one of the primary order in an infinitesimal degree.*

By a simple substitution of terms which requires no special explanation, our argument from number, so far as applies directly to the subject in hand, may be summed up thus :

While divinity involves humanity in its highest potency, humanity involves [implies] divinity in a minimum degree [germinally].

PHYSIOLOGICAL DEMONSTRATION.

We may here make a transition to the organic law of personal procreation, the substratum of which law we have attempted to give in the last of the three formulæ which were to constitute one and the same *lemma* to our first enunciated proposition. We may commence the proof of that formula by showing that the essential procreative power in each individual of a given organic species is *in idea* a summary of the procreative power of the whole species; in other words, that there is a *tendency* in each individual to produce the species entire, with all its normally arranged and correlated individuals.† Now a species is by definition limited to those individuals which either have or *might have* descended from a single individual or pair (the pair being organically but a polarized unit).‡

* The *radix personæ* analogous to the unit value of our symbol 1^{∞} ought, if the analogy be good, to be regarded as in respect to *real value* standing with the primary order, but in *idea* (i.e. as the ideal result of an infinite evolution or development) standing with the secondary order. In this view it becomes a true medium [*mediator*] between the two orders.

† Glimpses of a law of universal harmony between the proper individuals of an organic species are discoverable in the structure of a plant which of itself constitutes as it were a species in miniature; the single branches being distinct individuals, the single leaves too having strictly speaking a claim to organic individuality, and finally the millions of constituent cells having and in the last resort [e.g. at the beginning of germ-formation in the incipient seed] exercising the same claim. The branches, when all developed, are found to be arranged according to a geometrico-numerical law, the same law indeed by which the leaves are arranged upon the branches; so that the leaves of a tree, for instance, of a given species, and of a given age or degree of development, are *in theory*, it may almost be said, as the Scripture says of the hairs of our head, "all numbered."

‡ This statement does not preclude the *ideal wholeness* of each component of the pair, as will be seen farther on.

There is, therefore, but one life in the species: and as this life may be wholly in one individual, so it may be wholly in every individual of which the one is the prototype. In other words, the species is brought simply by its definition within the range of application of that general axiom in relation to the dissemination of the organic or vital power in the individual: *the whole is in every part*.

Our formula, indeed, affirms this community of organic potency of the whole order of organized rational being, within which sphere of being must be included the divine Father of spirits (his very *paternity* being exponential of his organic, that is, *living* personality) and all within the circle of his true sonship, divine, angelic, and human.

And as all the individuals regularly descended from the same parent stock are universally reckoned to be of the same species, so is the divine Father with his first-born Son, the *express image of his person*, identified in *species* with numerous secondary progeny of angels and men; these latter [angels and men] differing only, if differing at all except in degree of development, as *varieties* or *races*, mere modifications of the same universal type, and this type the image of God.

If, therefore, the essentially self-procreative life of the species, original in the first All-Father, be, as we have endeavored to show, universally diffused throughout the species in some measure or mode of its [the life's] entirety, then must there be in like manner diffused the correlative All-Sonship *in potentia*. Or, if in this connection we may be allowed the use of a metaphor, the All-Intelligent's first all-expressive *Word* can, as we may reasonably imagine, be echoed or repeated at least faintly by all who share in the universal reason. Again, to put the same conception under an aspect familiar to the naturalist, there cannot be denied to the human race, as a race of the grand rational species, that inherent characteristic of all natural races, *a tendency to return by procreation to the primitive type*: for though in most cases of animal and vegetable races such return may be a long step *downward*, this does not prove that in the case of rational beings there may not be normally an equally strong, if not a stronger, tendency to reproduce the primal type of the rational, though the attainment of such a result

should be by an infinite step *upward*, since the contrast of inclinations thus presented is but the natural contrast between the rational and the irrational.*

If it cannot be assumed that the tendency in question will *independently* eventuate in an actual reversion to the divine Image proper in any single case of human birth, the denial of a right to such assumption is not equivalent to the denial of the fact of such a tendency. A tendency exists in every female to produce young; yet there is required a specific stimulative agency in order to overcome a certain inertia in the germinal organism.

That incipient organism in the female which, if properly fructified, will result in a birth, is called an *ovum*; the male *coefficient* of the *ovum*† is, without doubt, its exact equal in value‡: so we may assume the primitive ovum as the general symbol of the unisexual individual's reproductive capacity, whatever be the order of being.

Now our *lemma*, being regarded as proved, furnishes this important link of argument for our specific proposition with regard to Christ's Human Sonship, namely:

There belongs in the normal constitution of every human being the EQUIVALENT OF AN OVUM DIVINUM.§

In order to see clearly the full force of this statement, it will be needful to consider a little more particularly the relation of the sexual co-factors in procreation. Among some of the single-celled aquatic vegetables the method of propagation is by the *conjugation* or growing together of two cells *not distinguishably different* from each other, the adjacent walls being so removed as to allow the fluid contents of the two cells freely to commingle. In these mingled contents originate the reproductive spore-cells. Here we have doubtless a minimum sexual development, but at the same time an index

* Nature when elevated by extraneous cultivation *seems* inclined to fall back to its original plane, as the water of the cloud returns to the ocean; but it may be, nevertheless, that in a more comprehensive view it will be found that all nature "groaneth and travaileth" in expectation of results above itself.

† The ovum in the case of persons might then be called the *physiological radix personæ*.

‡ This equality will, directly, be illustrated from a fact in natural history.

§ Comp. Gen. 3: 15. Gen. 22: 18. Gal. 3: 16.

to one of the most important laws in this department, namely, *that the primitive sexual co-factors are essentially equal.*

Again, in the higher forms of vegetation, where the sexual relation of reproductive organs is distinct, the masculine or pollen cell communicates its contents to the prime embryonic cell or vesicle only through two or more membranes—the *actual* communication being probably thus rendered, as it were, *infinitesimal*. The same holds good with respect to the higher animals. “In birds,” says one writer on natural history, “the ova exist ready formed in the mother before fecundation; and it is not a rare occurrence to see eggs laid without impregnation similar in every respect to those which produce young.” But such ready-formed or primitive ova are by no means peculiar to birds: they belong almost to the whole animal kingdom. They belong, too, to the human race. The difference between the embryo life of birds and that of viviparous animals lies chiefly in the place of incubation—this being in the one case without the mother, in the other case within. But this difference is of so little consequence that of two closely allied species of the batrachian order, one is viviparous and the other oviparous,* the eggs of the latter being fructified *after* their separation from the mother.

The summing up of the evidence under this particular head appears to be *that the feminine factor of generation is substantially a complete germ*; the special office of fecundation being to promote the development of this germ: at the same time there being in this germ, pure and simple, a disposition towards self-development almost, and even in particular cases quite, transcending *absolute* latency; so that in certain ova the process initiatory to embryo-formation has been observed, it is said, actually to commence independently of fecundation.†

The apparent insignificance to which this single view reduces the male factor of generation must be conceived as only apparent, and not as contradicting the law of *equality of the sexual co-factors* just now enunciated.

The organic first principle that the whole is substantially in each essential part here again applies.

* Vogt, Thierleben, § 215.

† *Id.* § 217.

Now, applying these principles within the sphere of ordinary humanity, we should say that a child is both *equally* and *integrally* the offspring of each parent.

Again, if we suppose the human *ovum divinum* in any case to be fecundated according to the Scripture history of Christ's earthly generation, what are we to look for in the result but a *divine Son of man* and a *human Son of God*, not merely one and inseparable, but *one and identical*.

Such an offspring would of course sustain to humanity a *normal and integral sonship*.

Again, this same hypothetical offspring of Deity and humanity would evidently be exponential of a *maximum* relationship between the human and the divine—that relationship, namely, in which the divine and human would be radically and completely identified in the same person.

But the personality of Christ must be exponential of a like maximum relationship, he being the “one Mediator between God and men, the *man* Christ Jesus”; and also “Immanuel, *God* with us,” “God manifest in the flesh”—Godhead and manhood *in him* coming to a perfect oneness; and consequently the difference between divinity and humanity being *in him* reduced to nothing.

Hence our *a priori* developed conception of a divine-human person is homogeneous with Christ's actual personality. Therefore we may conclude that Christ is *normally and integrally* “THE SON OF MAN”; or, in other words, that as man he is radically the offspring of an *implication of Deity** inherent in humanity as such, so that even as the Son of man he is divine.

The converse of the last statement, namely, that *as the Son of God he is human*, must also hold good according to the whole tenor of the foregoing argument.

It follows that the *historical* life of Christ as a divine-human person was, philosophically speaking, simply a *true exponent of his essential and eternal nature*; and that there is nothing rationally inconceivable in his frequent appearance in a *human similitude* before his historical incarnation.

* The rational pole of this implication may be viewed as a kind of *ovum* (*divinum*) *rationale* or *latent idea*, which, being divinely fructified, will result in “Christ's being formed in us.”